UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,862	02/25/2004	Sergey Shokhor	1361008-2019/10.0100U1	3678

38878 7590 11/28/2011

F5 Networks, Inc.
c/o Frommer Lawrence & Haug LLP.
745 Fifth Avenue
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER	
KEEHN, RICHARD G	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2456	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/28/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/786,862	SHOKHOR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	RICHARD G. KEEHN	2456	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 September 2011*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.

4)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

5)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are pending in the application.

5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

7)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are rejected.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

9)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

10)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/12/2011*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. **Claims 1-33 have been examined and are pending.**

2. **Claim 34 is cancelled.**

3. **No new claims are presented.**

4. **Applicant's amendments necessitate a new ground of rejection.**

Accordingly, this Office action is made FINAL.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. **Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7,308,703 B2 (Wright et al.), and further in view of US 7,185,364 B2 (Knouse et al.) and US 6,836,888 B1 (Basu et al.).**

As to Claim 32, Wright et al. anticipate a method implemented at a server device for managing access to a resource over a network, comprising:

receiving a request for access to the resource from a client device (Wright et al. disclose reception of client request – Figure 10A, elements 1014 and 1024);

determining a level of security software enabled on the client device (Wright et al. disclose determining a client's security software status as active or inactive and basing restrictions to client access based on the client's security status – Column 2, lines 17-64; In addition, column 2, lines 60-64 disclose that security features of the communication session between the mobile device and another computer are determined. In other words, to check the session's security features, one *or both* communicating party's security configuration is checked.)

including what antivirus software is active on the client device (Wright et al. disclose policy based on anti-virus software status - Column 18. lines 35-39)

and whether a hacker tool is enabled on the client device (Wright et al. Column 20, lines 35-42 disclose that the security software can be a hacker tool VPN);

applying a dynamic policy to the access based, in part, on the determined level of security software enabled (Wright et al. disclose determining a client's security software status as active or inactive and basing restrictions to client access based on the client's security status – Column 2, lines 17-64; and both of the communicating devices are checked for security features because the communication session is analyzed between the mobile device and another computer - 2:60-64, 7:11-14, and 7:28-36); and

applying a restriction to the client device for access by the client device to the requested resource, the restriction based on the applied dynamic policy (Wright et al. disclose determining a client's security software status as active or inactive and basing restrictions to client access based on the client's security status – Column 2, lines 17-64; and both of the communicating devices are checked for security features because

the communication session is analyzed between the mobile device and another computer - 2:60-64, 7:11-14, and 7:28-36).

Wright et al. disclose that the communication session between two devices is examined for security status, and the dynamic policy application, however they are not explicit on using the server device to apply communication restrictions. However, Knouse et al. disclose

at the server device (Knouse et al. disclose using the server device to apply a policy in response to t user request for resource access based on the requestor's configuration and the nature of the resources requested - 8:32-66),

using the server device (Knouse et al. disclose using the server device to apply a policy in response to t user request for resource access based on the requestor's configuration and the nature of the resources requested - 8:32-66); and

in response to the received request (Knouse et al. disclose using the server device to apply a policy in response to t user request for resource access based on the requestor's configuration and the nature of the resources requested - 8:32-66); and

and the requested resource (Knouse et al. disclose using the server device to apply a policy in response to t user request for resource access based on the requestor's configuration and the nature of the resources requested - 8:32-66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine using the server device to apply communication restrictions; and in response to the received request; and the requested resource taught

by Knouse et al., with applying the dynamic policy taught by Wright et al., in order to customize responses to individual users – (Knouse et al. - 8:32-66).

The combination of Wright et al. and Knouse et al. does not disclose employing a virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device. However, Basu et al. disclose

employing a virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device (Basu et al. disclose the use of virtual sandbox at the client device and the sandbox encrypting resources such that the key is stored at a remote server - 13:13:22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine employing a virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device taught by Basu et al., with employing a virtual sandbox taught by the combination of Wright et al. and Knouse et al., in order to securely distribute keys over remote networks - (Basu et al. – 13:19-22).

7. **Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 13-18 and 20-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7,308,703 B2 (Wright et al.), and further in view of US 7,430,524 B2 (Shah et al.), and US 7,185,364 B2 (Knouse et al.) and US 6,836,888 B1 (Basu et al.).**

As to Claims 1, 10, 22, 28 and 31, Wright et al. disclose an apparatus, method implemented at a network device, a network appliance and a computer readable storage medium that includes data and instructions, wherein the execution of the instructions on a computing device provides, and an apparatus, respectively, for managing access to a resource over a network, comprising:

a receiver that receives a request for access to the resource from a client device (Wright et al. disclose reception of client request – Column 15, lines 62-63); and

a policy manager, coupled to the receiver, that is performs actions, including (Wright et al. disclose the policy module – Column 15, lines 40-42):

including determining whether client security software other than a virtual sandbox is active on the client device (Wright et al. disclose determining a client's security software status as active or inactive and basing restrictions to client access based on the client's security status – Column 2, lines 17-64);

the configuration of the client device based on the inspection (Wright et al. disclose determining a client's security software status as active or inactive and basing restrictions to client access based on the client's security status – Column 2, lines 17-64);

applying a dynamic policy for the access based, in part, on the received configuration (Wright et al. disclose determining a client's security software status as active or inactive and basing restrictions to client access based on the client's security status – Column 2, lines 17-64); and

applying a restriction to the client device for access by the client device to the requested resource, the restriction based on the applied dynamic policy (Wright et al. disclose determining a client's security software status as active or inactive and basing restrictions to client access based on the client's security status – Column 2, lines 17-64);

and whether a hacker tool is enabled on the client device (**CLAIM 31 Only**) (Wright et al. Column 20, lines 35-42 disclose that the security software can be a hacker tool VPN).

Wright et al. disclose that the communication session between two devices is examined for security status, and the dynamic policy application, however they are not explicit on using the apparatus to apply communication restrictions. However, Knouse et al. disclose

using the apparatus (Knouse et al. disclose using the server device to apply a policy in response to t user request for resource access based on the requestor's configuration and the nature of the resources requested - 8:32-66); and

from the client device (Knouse et al. disclose using the server device to apply a policy in response to t user request for resource access based on the requestor's configuration and the nature of the resources requested - 8:32-66);

in response to the received request (Knouse et al. disclose using the server device to apply a policy in response to t user request for resource access based on the requestor's configuration and the nature of the resources requested - 8:32-66); and

and the requested resource (Knouse et al. disclose using the server device to apply a policy in response to t user request for resource access based on the requestor's configuration and the nature of the resources requested - 8:32-66).

The motivation and obviousness arguments for Knouse et al. are the same as in Claim 32.

The combination of Wright et al. and Knouse et al. does not disclose downloading a component onto the client device, wherein the downloaded component inspects the client device to detect a configuration of the client device and receiving from the downloaded component, but Shah et al. disclose

downloading a component onto the client device, wherein the downloaded component inspects the client device to detect a configuration of the client device (Shah et al. – Column 76, lines 9-25 disclose downloading an agent onto a client device to inspect the client device to determine the client device's configuration, and reporting said configuration back to the server that sent the agent); and

receiving from the downloaded component (Shah et al. – Column 76, lines 9-25 disclose downloading an agent onto a client device to inspect the client device to determine the client device's configuration, and reporting said configuration back to the server that sent the agent).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine sending an agent to determine a client's configuration and reporting back to the sender taught by Shah et al. with determining the client configuration taught by the combination of Wright et al. and Knouse et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to determine information regarding a plurality of client devices for system modeling (Shah et al. – Column 76, lines 40-51).

The combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al. and Shah et al. does not disclose employing a virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device. However, Basu et al. disclose employing a virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device (Basu et al. disclose the use of virtual sandbox at the client device and the sandbox encrypting resources such that the key is stored at a remote server - 13:13:22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine employing a virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device taught by Basu et al., with employing a virtual sandbox taught by the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al. and Shah et al., in order to securely distribute keys over remote networks - (Basu et al. – 13:19-22).

As to Claim 2, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the apparatus of claim 1, wherein determining the configuration of the client device further comprises:

if the client device is configured to not download the component, then receiving the configuration of the client device through a browser residing on the client device

(Shah et al. disclose the server capable of determining client's configuration via a plug and play interface which those of ordinary skill in the art would know to include plug and play browsers, as an alternative to the downloadable component determining the configuration and sending it back to the server – Column 76, lines 15-22).

The motivation and obviousness arguments are the same as in Claim 1.

As to Claim 4, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the apparatus of claim 1, wherein determining the configuration of the client device further comprises

determining information associated with the connection between the client device and the resource (Wright et al. disclose determining information associated with the communication session between the mobile device and another computer – Column 3, lines 4-8).

As to Claim 5, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the apparatus of claim 1, wherein inspecting the client device to detect a configuration further comprises

detecting if security software is installed on the client device and if security software is installed, inspecting the security software to detect if the security software is active or disabled (Wright et al. disclose determining a client's security software status as active or inactive and basing restrictions to client access based on the client's security status – Column 2, lines 17-64).

As to Claim 6, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the apparatus of claim 1, wherein applying the restriction further comprises

employing a virtual sandbox that is configured based on the applied dynamic policy (Wright et al. Column 20, lines 35-42 disclose that the security software can be a hacker tool VPN, the VPN being a virtual sandbox).

As to Claim 7, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the apparatus of claim 1,

wherein the restriction includes at least one downloadable component (Wright et al. disclose determining a client's security software status as active or inactive and basing restrictions to client access based on the client's security status – Column 2, lines 17-64).

As to Claim 8, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the apparatus of claim 1,

wherein the restriction intercepts a communication between the client device and the apparatus (Wright et al. discloses the interception of files as a restriction – Column 7, lines 59-67).

As to Claim 9, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the apparatus of claim 1, wherein applying the restriction further comprises

performing at least one of inhibiting a file save, and inhibiting a file print (Wright et al. discloses inhibiting a file save by preventing write access to hackers – 20:35-42).

As to Claim 11, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the method of claim 10, further comprising

in response to receiving the request for access to the resource, transmitting a downloadable component to the client device (Wright et al. disclose determining a client's security software status as active or inactive and basing restrictions to client access based on the client's security status – Column 2, lines 17-64).

As to Claim 13, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the method of claim 10, wherein receiving the configuration further comprises:

receiving information indicating at least one of one level of trust associated with the client device, a type of encryption enabled on the client device, a type of antivirus enabled on the client device, a security feature enabled on the client device, a browser type, an operating system configuration, a security certificate, and if a hacker tool is enabled on the client device (Wright et al. disclose determining a client's security

software status as active or inactive and basing restrictions to client access based on the client's security status – Column 2, lines 17-64; Wright et al. Column 20, lines 35-42 disclose that the security software can be a hacker tool VPN).

As to Claim 14, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the method of claim 10, wherein receiving the configuration further comprises:

receiving information indicating a level of trust of the client device (Wright et al disclose the trust level determination – Column 18, lines 19-23).

As to Claim 15, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the method of claim 10, wherein receiving the configuration further comprises:

receiving information indicating a characteristic of an enabled security application enabled (Wright et al disclose the trust level determination – Column 18, lines 19-23).

As to Claim 16, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the method of claim 10, wherein applying the restriction further comprises

downloading a component to the client device (Wright et al. disclose determining a client's security software status as active or inactive and basing restrictions to client access based on the client's security status – Column 2, lines 17-64).

As to Claim 17, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the method of claim 10, wherein applying the restriction further comprises

configuring a virtual sandbox to intercept a communication between the client device and the resource (Wright et al. discloses the interception of files as a restriction – Column 7, lines 59-67; Wright et al. Column 20, lines 35-42 disclose that the security software can be a hacker tool VPN, the VPN being a virtual sandbox).

As to Claim 18, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the method of claim 17, wherein intercepting the communication further comprises

blocking a download of at least one file to the client device (Wright et al. discloses the interception of files as a restriction – Column 7, lines 59-67).

As to Claim 20, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the method of claim 10, wherein applying the dynamic policy further comprises

determining at least one of a connector, and an adaptor to enable the access to the resource (Wright et al. disclose the determination of network adapter - Column 7, lines 26-37).

As to Claim 21, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the method of claim 10, wherein applying the dynamic policy further comprises

restricting the access to the resource (Wright et al. discloses the interception of files as a restriction – Column 7, lines 59-67).

As to Claim 23, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the network appliance of claim 22, wherein the processor is configured to perform further actions, comprising:

in response to receiving the request for access to the resource, receiving additional information about the configuration of the client device through a query with a browser residing on the client device (Shah et al. – Column 76, lines 15-22 disclose the server capable of determining client's configuration via a plug and play interface which those of ordinary skill in the art would know to include plug and play browsers, as an alternative to the downloadable component determining the configuration and sending it back to the server).

The motivation and obviousness arguments are the same as in Claim 1.

As to Claim 24, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the network appliance of claim 22, wherein applying the restriction further comprises

employing a virtual sandbox that is configured based on the applied dynamic policy (Wright et al. Column 20, lines 35-42 disclose that the security software can be a hacker tool VPN, the VPN being a virtual sandbox).

As to Claim 25, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the network appliance of claim 23, wherein determining the configuration of the client device further comprises:

if the client device is not configured to receive a downloadable component, receiving information about the configuration of the client device through a browser application residing within the client device (Shah et al. disclose the server capable of determining client's configuration via a plug and play interface which those of ordinary skill in the art would know to include plug and play browsers, as an alternative to the downloadable component determining the configuration and sending it back to the server – Column 76, lines 15-22).

The motivation and obviousness arguments are the same as in Claim 1.

As to Claim 26, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the network appliance of claim 22, wherein applying the dynamic policy further comprises:

if the client device is configured to restricting a download of a component, restricting access to the resource (Wright et al. disclose determining a client's security

software status as active or inactive and basing restrictions to client access based on the client's security status – Column 2, lines 17-64).

As to Claim 27, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the network appliance of claim 22, wherein applying the restriction further comprises:

if the client device is configured to restrict a download of a component, intercepting a communication between the client device and the requested resource to perform at least one of preventing an access to file, and restricting an action (Wright et al. discloses the interception of files as a restriction – Column 7, lines 59-67).

As to Claim 29, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the computer readable storage medium of claim 28, wherein applying the restriction further comprises

configuring a Virtual sandbox to intercept a communication between the client device and the resource (Wright et al. discloses the interception of files as a restriction – Column 7, lines 59-67; Wright et al. Column 20, lines 35-42 disclose that the security software can be a hacker tool VPN, the VPN being a virtual sandbox).

As to Claim 30, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the computer readable storage medium of claim 28, wherein applying the restriction further comprises

blocking a download of at least one file to the client device (Wright et al. discloses the interception of files as a restriction – Column 7, lines 59-67).

8. **Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of US 7,200,272 B2 (Ishikawa).**

As to Claim 19, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the method of claim 10.

The combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. does not disclose if the access to the resource is terminated, performing cleanup on the client device including at least one of deleting a cached file, deleting a temporary file, and enabling a disabled system command, but Ishikawa discloses, wherein applying the restriction further comprises:

if the access to the resource is terminated, performing cleanup on the client device including at least one of deleting a cached file, deleting a temporary file, and enabling a disabled system command (Ishikawa – Column 5, lines 2-12 disclose the client's cache manager deleting the user's cache as part of a cleanup).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine performing cleanup on the client device including at least one of deleting a cached file, deleting a temporary file, and enabling a disabled system command taught by Ishikawa, with applying a restriction to the access for the

requested resource based on the applied dynamic policy taught by the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to avoid system resources from sitting at their maximum limit, thus freeing up resources for other applications to use (Ishikawa - Column 5, lines 8-12).

9. **Claims 3 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al., and further in view of US 2002/0111852 A1 (Levine).**

As to Claim 3, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the apparatus of claim 1.

The combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. does not disclose wherein the received configuration indicates whether the client device is operating as a kiosk, but Levine discloses

wherein the received configuration indicates whether the client device is operating as a kiosk (Levine – Page 2, ¶ [0022] discloses determining the type of client device and whether it's a cell phone, kiosk, PDA, laptop, desk computer, terminal or any other access device).

The motivation and obviousness arguments are similar to that of Claim 33.

As to Claim 12, the combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. discloses the method of claim 10, wherein receiving the configuration further comprises.

The combination of Wright et al., Knouse et al., Shah et al. and Basu et al. does not disclose receiving information indicating whether the client device is a laptop, personal computer, kiosk, or a mobile device, but Levine discloses

receiving information indicating whether the client device is a laptop, personal computer, kiosk, or a mobile device (Levine – Page 2, ¶ [0022] discloses determining the type of client device and whether it's a cell phone, kiosk, PDA, laptop, desk computer, terminal or any other access device).

The motivation and obviousness arguments are similar to that of Claim 33.

10. **Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7,308,703 B2 (Wright et al.), and further in view of US 2002/0111852 A1 (Levine), and US 7,185,364 B2 (Knouse et al.) and US 6,836,888 B1 (Basu et al.).**

As to Claim 33, Wright et al. disclose a method implemented at a network appliance for managing access to a resource over a network, comprising:

receiving a request for access to the resource from a client device (Wright et al. disclose reception of client request – Column 15, lines 62-63);

determining whether client computing security software is active on the client device or whether a hacker tool is enabled on the client device (Wright et al. disclose determining a client's security software status as active or inactive and basing restrictions to client access based on the client's security status – Column 2, lines 17-64; Wright et al. Column 20, lines 35-42 disclose that the security software can be a hacker tool VPN); and

applying a restriction to the client device for access by the client device to the requested resource, the restriction based on the determined configuration of the client device (Wright et al. disclose determining a client's security software status as active or inactive and basing restrictions to client access based on the client's security status – Column 2, lines 17-64, Figure 10A, elements 1024-1034).

Wright et al. disclose that the communication session between two devices is examined for security status, and the dynamic policy application, however they are not explicit on using the server device to apply communication restrictions. However, Knouse et al. disclose

using the network appliance (Knouse et al. disclose using the server device to apply a policy in response to t user request for resource access based on the requestor's configuration and the nature of the resources requested - 8:32-66); and

in response to the received request (Knouse et al. disclose using the server device to apply a policy in response to t user request for resource access based on the requestor's configuration and the nature of the resources requested - 8:32-66); and

and the requested resource (Knouse et al. disclose using the server device to apply a policy in response to t user request for resource access based on the requestor's configuration and the nature of the resources requested - 8:32-66).

The motivation and obviousness arguments for Knouse et al. are the same as in Claim 32.

The combination of Wright et al. and Knouse et al. does not explicitly disclose determining if the client device is configured as a kiosk or a mobile device, but Levine discloses

determining if the client device is configured as a kiosk or a mobile device (Levine – Page 2, ¶ [0022] discloses determining the type of client device and whether it's a cell phone, kiosk, PDA, laptop, desk computer, terminal or any other access device).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine determining if the client device is configured as a kiosk or a mobile device taught by Levine, with determining client configuration taught by the combination of Wright et al. and Knouse et al., in order to personalize content delivery (Levine – Page 2, ¶ [0015]).

The combination of Wright et al., Levine and Knouse et al. does not disclose employing a virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device. However, Basu et al. disclose

employing a virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device (Basu et al. disclose the use

of virtual sandbox at the client device and the sandbox encrypting resources such that the key is stored at a remote server - 13:13:22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine employing a virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device taught by Basu et al., with employing a virtual sandbox taught by the combination of Wright et al., Levine and Knouse et al., in order to securely distribute keys over remote networks - (Basu et al. – 13:19-22).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RICHARD G. KEEHN whose telephone number is (571)270-5007. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9am - 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RGK
/Salad Abdullahi/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2456